

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-9, 11 and 14-28 are pending in the application. By this amendment, Applicant cancels claims 3 and 13 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niwa (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0225696 A1) in view of Christensen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,543).

Applicant respectfully submits the following in traversal.

Rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13-28 under § 103(a) over Niwa in view of Christensen

In view of the rejections, the Applicant amends claims 1 and 8 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 3 and claim 11 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 13. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable because Niwa in view of Christensen do not disclose or suggest all elements of the claim. In the rejection of claims 3 and 13, the Examiner asserts:

With respect to claims 3 and 13, Niwa as modified teaches wherein the header comprises information on the number of the plurality of files included in the SMIL integrated file and information on a length of the SMIL integrated file (Christensen, column 6 lines 32-39, column 7 lines 33-36).

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method wherein the header comprises information on the number of the plurality of files included in the SMIL integrated file and information on a length of the SMIL integrated file.

In the section of Christensen cited by the Examiner as allegedly disclosing the above, Christensen discloses a header 52 as containing application information, a creation date for the package, and copyright information (col. 6, lines 32-39). Christensen, however, fails to disclose or suggest that the header 52 includes information on the number of content files 20 included in the package 40. Rather, by disclosing a header containing application information, Christensen merely refers to a particular program such as Microsoft Word (col. 1, lines 22-29).

The Examiner also cites col. 7, lines 33-36 to suggest that Christensen discloses a header comprising information on a length of the SMIL integrated file. This section of Christensen, however, discloses the length of a tag 50 stored in the tag size field 58 in the metadata 42, i.e., merely discloses the information that is in the metadata 42 and not the information that is in the header 52. The header 52, however, in Christensen comprises no information of a length of the tag 50 or length of the package 40.

In conclusion, Christensen fails to disclose or suggest a header comprising information on the number of the plurality of files included in the SMIL integrated file and information on a length of the SMIL integrated file.

For at least the reasons submitted above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 and 11 are patentable.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, and 14-28, which depend from claim 1, 8 or 11, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 20-22 are patentable because Christensen fails to disclose that the plurality of the indexing information are consecutively disposed together and precedes the plurality of resource files.

First, Christensen does not describe in detail a package which contains two wrappers but merely makes a general statement that a package can have more than one wrapper. Fig. 5 shows a **single** wrapper 40 including a directory of tags 54 and some metadata 50 for a single content 20. Therefore, there is nothing to suggest that if there is a package with multiple wrappers, all of the directory of tags 54 and all of the metadata 50 for all the wrappers would be consecutively disposed **together**. Instead, Fig. 5 suggests that multiple wrappers would mean that each of the multiple directory of tags 54, for example, would be disposed separately in their corresponding wrapper.

Also, Applicant argues that the recitations of claims 20-22 do not present “nonfunctional descriptive material because it does not affect the way a computer operates,” and that these claims do not present a mere “description of information that does not impart any functionality,” as alleged by the Examiner. Applicant notes that the Examiner previously presented the above generic statements in the previous Office Action of November 15, 2007. In response, the Applicant respectfully submitted a detailed explanation as to how the recitations of claims 20-22 should be considered by the Examiner.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner again repeats the aforementioned generic statements and does not address the Applicant’s arguments. Applicant notes that “Office

personnel should consider all rebuttal arguments and evidence presented by applicants.” MPEP § 2145 (citing *Soni*, 54 F.3d at 750, 34 USPQ2d at 1687 (error not to consider evidence presented in the specification)). Therefore, the Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider the Applicant’s explanation in the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9 in the Amendment of February 15, 2008.

In response to the rejection of claims 5 and 15, the Examiner states that Niwa as modified with the teachings of Christensen, teaches wherein plurality of file indexing information comprises respective name, length, and offset information of each of the plurality of files included in the SMIL integrated file. Christensen, however, discloses an offset information contained in a directory 54 (Col 6, Lines 35-39), the name of the tag contained in the tag name field 64 in the metadata 42 (Col 7, Line 65), and the length of tag 50 contained in the metadata 42 (Col 7, Lines 33-38). Therefore, the name, length, and offset information of each of the plurality of files included in the package 40 in Christensen are located in different files and Christensen does not disclose the claimed plurality of file indexing information.

For at least the reasons submitted above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 15 are patentable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



S. Stuart Lee  
Registration No. 61,124

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 9, 2008